UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,334	12/22/2005	Stephen Loomis	AOL0111-2	1545

22862 7590 08/07/2009

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
FLANDERS, ANDREW C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2614	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/538,334	LOOMIS, STEPHEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANDREW C. FLANDERS	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 June 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 June 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 23 June 2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 23 June 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant alleges:

> While Applicant agrees that Berman does not explicitly disclose said program including computer-readable instructions for specifying number of songs to cache in advance and size of a pre-buffer cache, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's finding of obviousness. Rather, Applicant asserts that Berman teaches away from instructions of the type Applicant claims.

Specifically:

> In particular, the amount of data buffered by Berman is set by the amount of memory that Berman's processor can access - not by computer-readable instructions specifying a number of beginning portions of songs to cache in advance and size of a pre-buffer cache. (Berman, col. 11, lines 29-43.) Specifically, Berman states "[t]he number of buffers that can be accommodated by the playback unit is determined by the amount of memory (bytes) that the playback microprocessor can access, so the

> number of buffers available will be variable." (Berman, col. 11, lines 34-38.)
>
> Based on this statement, one skilled in the relevant art would recognize that Berman's buffers are configured based on factors such as the amount of available physical memory, the number of available memory addressing bits, system architecture, etc, all of which are generally static. In such a system, one skilled in the relevant art would generally configure the buffers at an application or system build time. Accordingly, there is no need or reason for Berman to employ "computer-readable instructions specifying a number of beginning portions of songs to cache in advance and size of a pre-buffer cache" as Applicant's Claim 1 now recites.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. While not explicitly disclosed, it is obvious that a program controls the memory space as it is operating in order for it to carry out particular functions. In the particular combination, the control programs must set aside a specific area of memory in order to buffer the songs. Berman specifically states in regards to Fig. 11 that "The playback unit memory may be segregated into a number of sequential buffers…" Thus, while the resources in Berman may be static, Berman at least recognizes that portions of those resources are to be segregated and used for a particular function. Even though the resources may be static, that does not mean they are limited to a particular number of buffers. While there will necessarily be a maximum number of buffers (limited only by system resources, as is every system, including Applicant's), this does not preclude the system for organizing some other number of buffers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 – 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berman (U.S. Patent 6,502,194) in view of Zainoulline (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0030660).

Regarding **Claim 1**,

Berman discloses:

An apparatus for smoothly playing a pre-determined sequence of songs transmitted from a server over the internet (Fig. 1 element 100), comprising:

a processor (Fig. 1 element 118),

a first memory (116) that stores at least one control program used by the processor to control the playing of the predetermined sequence of songs (col. 6 lines 40 – 50),

wherein the at least one program causes said processor at least to:

as a song starts to play, start to download, a beginning portion of a number of songs which are, in the predetermined sequence, subsequent to the playing song, to a pre-buffer cache (i.e. as the first song (Song 1) is being played, the playback unit continues to operate and, in background operations, continues to download the Song 1 data into the first buffer, and also downloads data for the other selected songs into the

other buffers in an alternating fashion. Each song will be placed into a different sequential buffer; col. 12 lines 10 – 16; the buffers in the same memory and thus common to one another via the same memory;);

if playback is skipped to a target song for which the beginning portion has been downloaded to the pre-buffer chache, start to play the downloaded beginning portion of the target song (i.e. this ensures that some portion of each selected song will be downloaded and available as soon as possible, thereby permitting the user to skip to one of the other selected songs after playback has begun; col. 12 lines 16 – 19);

while playing the downloaded beginning portion of the target song, start to download the rest of the target song (i.e. songs are downloaded as they are played and designated for buffers, col. 11 lines 65-67 and col. 12 lines 1 - 20).

Berman does not explicitly disclose the at least one control program including computer-readable instructions specifying a number of beginning portions of songs to cache in advance and size of a pre-buffer cache. However, Berman recognizes that the size of the buffer and number of songs are relatively flexible. Berman clearly talks about typical sizes that can be used for buffer size and that the memory may be segregated into a "number" of sequential buffers in the Memory Buffering Control section. Berman further discusses that the functionality of the device remains the same regardless of the memory space addressed. It would have been obvious to provide the allocation and setup of this buffer in this system using software as claimed. The system disclosed by Berman is a processor/memory type system which is notoriously well known to operate and function using software. While not expressly indicated, it is likely

that Berman performs these functions using software. Even if not, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to try given the notoriously well known components disclosed and their known interrelationships, (i.e. processor/software/memory) and the known benefits of a software system (ease of use, quick changes in operation, flexibility).

Berman does not explicitly disclose a second memory which is available to the at least one control program, or the wherein the pre-buffer cache is in an area in said second memory.

Zainoulline discloses a preview device having a CPU, RAM memory which loads the player programs, and staging memory which stores the preview clips (page 3 paragraph 0031).

Modifying Zainoulline to include this staging memory separate to the RAM storing the control programs in order to store the music data in Berman instead of Zainoulline's only memory reads upon the limitation of a second memory which is available to said at least one program for operations and wherein the pre-buffer cache is in an area in said second memory.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to use Zainoulline's preview device with Berman's Memory Buffering Control playback method in order to create a more pleasing online shopping experience. Rather than a user having to wait for each individual song to buffer as they skip between preview clips, the combination would allow a user to smoothly switch between

media clips thereby saving the user time and avoiding annoying pauses between playback (Zainoulline paragraph 26).

Regarding **Claims 6, 7, 16 and 17**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim 1, the combination further discloses:

(a) and (b) are met by the rejection of claim 1 above;

The combination fails to explicitly disclose wherein the number of beginning portions of songs to pre-cache in advance and size of the pre-buffer are specified by a function call.

However, function calls within programs (such as the computer program made obvious by the combination) are notoriously well known in the art. The Microsoft Computer Dictionary defines a function call broadly as "A program's request for the services of a particular function. A function call is coded as the name of the function along with any parameters needed for the function to perform its task." Applying this to the combination, which clearly shows a flexible buffer system, would allow the program to set the number of buffers via one of these calls for the purpose of allowing the function to perform its task. Applying this known technique (i.e. a function call) to a known device (i.e. software setup for a flexible buffer system) would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Modifying the above would have provided predictable results (i.e. a software program call to set up the number of buffers) since the relatively

flexible buffer system disclosed by the combination doesn't explicitly set forth the means of implementation.

The combination further disclsoses;

(c) if playback is skipped from a playing song to a target song, checking whether the beginning portion of the target song is in the pre-buffer cache; and

(d) if the beginning portion of the target songis in the pre-buffer cache, playing the beginning portion of the target song from the pre-buffer cache (i.e. Berman further discloses checking to see if the track is in the buffer and if so beginning to stream track data from memory; Fig. 5 elements 506 and 512).

As stated above regarding claim 1, Berman discloses data in a given buffer is overwritten as it is processed and played. Thus, after the last segment of memory in a buffer for a song has been filled with a song data packet and that buffer is processed for listening, the next song data packet will be written to the first segment in that buffer (col. 12 lines 25 – 30). Therefore, as the system starts downloading the rest of the said target song, it is inherent that the data that has been in the buffer prior to the target song is overwritten (i.e. deleted) as the newer data is being processed and played. This reads upon the limitation of (f) deteing beginning portions of any songs prior to the target song in the predetermined sequence from the pre-buffer cache. Element (e) is met above regarding claim 1.

Regarding **Claims 2, 12 and 22**, in addition to the elements above regarding claim 1, the combination further discloses

wherein the beginning portion of the target song is approximately the data of the first ten seconds of the target song(in Berman in the preferred embodiment each data packet contains approximately ten seconds of compressed digital audio information; col. 11 lines 50 –52).

Regarding **Claim 3, 13, and 23**, in addition to the elements above regarding claim 1, the combination further discloses:

Berman discloses three buffers in a playback memory in Figure 11. The playback unit memory may be segregated into a number of sequential buffers, with each buffer preferably containing one song (col. 11 lines 30 – 32) and the number of buffers is determined by the 2MB buffer size and the amount of memory that the playback unit microprocessor can access, so the number of buffers available will be variable (col. 11 lines 34 –38). Since microprocessor accessible memories of, for example, 256 MB, are well known at the time of the invention, Berman's disclosure comprehends any number of buffers up to at least 128.

Regarding **Claims 4, 14, and 24**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim 1, the combination further discloses:

Berman further discloses that the buffers correspond to the following musical selections (col. 11 lines 63 – 65) and that the buffers are sequential buffers (col. 11 line 31). Berman discloses that the buffers correspond to the following musical selections as well as hold the data of the following songs to be played in sequential order.

Therefore, it is taught that the number of beginning portions of songs to cache in advance is all songs in the predetermined sequence of songs that are subsequent to the playing song.

Regarding **Claims 5, 15, and 25**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claim 1, the combination further discloses:

wherein the pre-buffer cache follows a first-in first-out algorithm and allows writing while reading (i.e. Berman further discloses The loop buffering operation progresses from left to right in Fig 12. Loop buffering is used to limit the size needed for each buffer. In particular, a buffer is not expected to have sufficient capacity to contain the entire data needed for one song. Rather data in a given buffer is overwritten as it is processed and played. Thus, after the last segment of memory in a buffer for a song has been filled with a song data packet and that buffer is processed for listening, the next song data packet will be written to the first segment in that buffer; col. 12 lines 22 – 30).

Regarding **Claims 8 and 18**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claims 7 and 17, the combination further discloses:

If the beginning portion for the target song is in the pre-buffer cache, downloading, consecutively, a beginning portion of each of a number of songs which are, in the predetermine sequence, subsequent to the target song, wherein if beginning portions of the one or more songs subsequent to the target song are already in the pre-

buffer cache, skipping the downloading of the beginning portions of the one or more songs already having beginning portions in the pre-buffer cache and downloading the beginning portions of the subsequent songs consecutively to make up the number of beginning portions of songs to cache in advance.

Berman discloses that portions of each selected song will be downloaded as the first one begins to play (col. 11 lines 56 and 57), the number of buffers may be variable (col. 11 lines 37 and 38), this ensures that some portion of each selected song will be downloaded and available as soon as possible, thereby permitting the user to skip to one of the other selected songs after playback has begun (col.12 lines 16 – 19), and as the first song (Song 1) is being played, the playback unit continues to operate and, in background operations, continues to download the Song 1 data into the first buffer, and also downloads data for the other selected songs into the other buffers in an alternating fashion. Each song will be placed into a different sequential buffer. (col.12 lines 10 – 16). Thus it is taught that as soon as the user skips ahead to another song, the subsequent songs will be downloaded into the buffer sequentially in order to fill the number of buffers as the system downloads the portions of the other songs not playing as shown above, as well as downloading the portions for the next songs in advance.

Regarding **Claims 9 and 19**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claims 8 and 18, the combination further discloses:

(i) if no skip command is received while the target song is playing, as the playing of the target song ends, playing song immediately subsequent to the target song

Berman further discloses that if a user wants to hear Song1, Song2, and Song 3, the playback unit downloads a number of packets for Song1 into the first available buffer, Once a sizeable amount of compressed audio information is stored for that song, the playback unit begins to process the information and play the song (col.11 lines 66 and 67, col. 12 lines 1-4). It is inherent that if the user selects these three songs, starts playing Song1, and doesn't skip ahead that Song 2 will follow after Song1 has completed playing based on the functionality of the buffer.

Element (j) is met by the rejection of claim 7 above.

Regarding **Claims 10 and 20**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claims 7 and 17, the combination further discloses:

wherein if the beginning portion of the target song is not in the pre-buffer cache, the method further comprises:

(k) sending request to stop transmitting the playing song and to start transmitting the target song and at least substantially simultaneously and (n) begin playing the target song as a sufficient portion of the target song has been downloaded.

Berman discloses that As the first song (Song 1 is being played, the playback unit continues to operate and, in background operation, continues to download the Song 1 data into the first buffer, and also downloads data for the other selected songs in to the other buffers into an alternating fashion (col. 12 lines 10 – 14) and if a user wants to hear Song1, Song2, and Song 3, the playback unit downloads a number of packets for Song1 into the first available buffer, Once a sizeable amount of compressed audio

information is stored for that song, the playback unit begins to process the information and play the song (col.11 lines 66 and 67, col. 12 lines 1-4). Therefore, if a user starts playing Song1 and instantly skips to Song2 there will be no information stored in the buffer for Song2 therefore it is inherent that the system will stop playing Song 1 and automatically download the information for Song2.

Elements (l) (deleting pre cached like (f) in another playback) and (m) (downloading like (e) in another playback) are met by the rejection of claim 7 as stated above.

Regarding **Claims 11 and 21**, in addition to the elements stated above regarding claims 10 and 20, further use of the system allows for additional skips, pauses, plays etc and thus, element (p) is clearly comprehended above regarding claim 9 element (j), element (q) is clearly comprehended above regarding claim 9 element (i), element (r) is clearly comprehended above regarding claim 7 element (e), element (s) is clearly comprehended above regarding claim 8 element (h), and element (t) is clearly comprehended above regarding claim 7 element (g).

Claim 26 is met by the rejections of claims 1, 6 and 7 as stated above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW C. FLANDERS whose telephone number is (571)272-7516. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew C Flanders/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2614